

REMARKS

Applicant's traversal of the pending restriction is informed by the examiner's error in discounting the presence of a special technical feature, validating a singled, general inventive concept in this regard.

On page 2 of the September 12th action, Examiner Heincer asserts that "the compound of formula (I) ... cannot be a special technical feature" because, by "applicant's admission (pg 5 ¶2)," the recited formula (I) encompasses "compounds ... known in the art." For the alleged admission the examiner points to mention in the specification of compounds "to be excluded from the scope of" the claimed invention that conform to a formula appearing under paragraph indicator [0015] in the published application.

Applicants and the examiner apparently agree that "{B}" in this formula is $\text{CH}_2=\text{CH}-\text{CH}_2$. As originally presented, therefore, Formula (I) is understood to require that {B} have more than one organically polymerizable group. The examiner is heard to urge, however, that the aforementioned formula under paragraph indicator [0015] satisfies this requirement by having, *inter alia*, not only a "vinyl group" but also a "carboxylic acid group," which the examiner places within the "organically polymerizable" category.

Applicants respectfully demur at this position, which, it is submitted, does not comport with usage of "organically polymerizable" in the specification. In the interest of advancing prosecution, however, applicants have amended the claims to recite a "polymerizable group" that "contains a $\text{C}=\text{C}$ moiety," in accordance with the specification, e.g., in paragraph [0011].

Accordingly, there can be no question that the present claims are consistent with the subject-matter exclusion described in paragraph [0014], *et seq.* By the same token, applicants submit that the examiner's stated rationale for disallowing a special technical feature is inapposite to the present claims. For this reason, the examiner is requested to withdraw the pending restriction and to examine the claims of Groups I, II, and III together.

A favorable disposition of the present claims also is requested. Additionally, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required under 37 CFR §§ 1.16-1.17, and to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment accompany this response, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to the same deposit account. If any extensions is needed for timely acceptance of submitted papers, applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 CFR §1.136 and authorize payment of the relevant fee(s) from the deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 11 October 2007

By S. A. Bent

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5404
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Stephen A. Bent
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,768